



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,839	10/24/2001	Neil McClure	392902	6338

30955 7590 04/19/2006

LATHROP & GAGE LC  
4845 PEARL EAST CIRCLE  
SUITE 300  
BOULDER, CO 80301

EXAMINER

VAN DOREN, BETH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3623

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/074,839

Applicant(s)

MCCLURE, NEIL

Examiner

Beth Van Doren

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 February 2006.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The following is a final office action in response to communications received 02/10/2006. Claims 1, 24, and 43 have been amended. Claims 1-43 are pending in this application.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "substantially" used in claims 1, 24, and 43 renders the claim indefinite since it is not specifically clear as to what is considered "substantially equal" by the claimed invention. Clarification is required.

Claims 2-23 and 25-42 depend from claims 1 and 24 and are therefore also rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3623

5. Claims 1-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Openshaw, II et al. (U.S. 2002/0107724) in view of Miller et al. ("The Impact of Candidate name order on Election Outcomes").

As per claim 1, Openshaw, II et al. teaches an electronic voting system comprising:  
a memory storage device (See figure 4) containing  
ballot information including a plurality of ballot options in association with a contest (See figure 4, paragraphs 0019-20, 0033-6, 0041, wherein ballot information is stored by the system, including a plurality of valid, random ballot options);

a voting station (See figure 2, paragraph 0018) including  
an electronically configurable ballot information presentation device operable for  
presenting the ballot options in a selected order during a first voting session (See figure 4, paragraphs 0019-20, 0033-6, 0041, wherein the ballot is presented in a selected order) and

a voter input device operable for permitting voter directed ballot data entry to produce a  
cast ballot responsively to the ballot information presented by the ballot information presentation  
device (See figure 3, paragraphs 0022, 0026, 0065, wherein the voter makes selections and casts  
the ballot); and

a ballot rotation engine operable to change the selected order of ballot options according  
to predetermined ordering schema for additional voting sessions (See figure 4, paragraphs 0019-  
0020, 0041, wherein the ballots are rotated using randomization);

the ballot rotation engine operating on instructions to perform ballot rotation by  
generating electronically reconfigured ballots on demand during the course of an election to  
implement the schema in a controlled manner facilitating substantial fairness through rotation

Art Unit: 3623

over at least one level selected from the group consisting of an individual voting station, a voting precinct, a group of precincts supported at a polling place, and an entire election jurisdiction (See paragraphs 0019-0021, 0041, wherein ballot rotation is performed automatically by the system to ensure substantial fairness to all candidates across voting precincts and groups of voting precincts). However, Openshaw II et al. does not expressly disclose ballot images or substantially equal statistical fairness in rotation.

Miller et al. discloses ballot rotation in precincts using electronic voting systems, where ballot images are produced, and wherein the rotation produces substantially equal statistical fairness (See page 291-292, 295, 297 and 298-9, which discusses electronic voting systems and producing ballots in rotating name order to decrease bias towards certain candidates and create substantially equal statistical fairness. See page 324, which discloses rotating names on the ballot so each name appears first equally often. See also pages 300-304, which discloses statistical results).

Both Openshaw II, et al. and Miller et al. discuss changing the order of candidate names in ballots in order to ensure fairness. Openshaw II et al. specifically discloses the use of pre-approved, electronic random ballots in order to avoid the need of secure voting booths as other voters would be unable to observe a user's selections. Further, Miller et al. discloses the importance in rotating names to ensure that the name listed first on the ballot does not receive an unfair bias. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to consider the statistical fairness of rotation in order to increase the fairness of an election by ensuring that all candidates' names receive equal consideration. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use ballot

Art Unit: 3623

images in the system of Openshaw II et al. in order to increase the usability of the system by those voters who are hearing impaired. See paragraph, 0050 of Openshaw, II et al. that discloses the use of the system by the hearing impaired.

As per claim 2, Openshaw, II et al. teaches a network including a precinct control and a plurality of voting stations (See figures 2 and 4, paragraphs 0044-8, 0051, 0063, 0068, 0072, wherein the system has a control and has a plurality of voting terminals).

As pre claim 3, Openshaw, II et al. discloses wherein the precinct control unit is configured to access the memory storage device to obtain the ballot information and process the same to implement the ordering schema along the plurality of voting stations (See figures 2 and 4, paragraphs 0044-8, 0051, 0063, 0068, 0072, wherein the system has a control and has a plurality of voting terminals. See paragraphs 0019-0021, wherein the plurality of voting stations receive random rotated ballots read from computer memory).

As per claim 4, Openshaw, II et al. teaches wherein the ordering schema is implemented through program instructions to the precinct control unit for balancing the selected order of ballot options amongst the plurality of voting stations so as not to favor any one of the plurality of ballot options at a precinct level during the course of an election (See figures 2 and 4, paragraphs 0044-8, 0051, 0063, 0068, 0072, wherein the system has a control and has a plurality of voting terminals. See paragraphs 0019-0021 and 0041, wherein the randomized ballots are matched to the stations in order to allow fairness in the vote).

As per claim 5, Openshaw, II et al. discloses wherein the ballot information includes a plurality of contests each with associated ballot options, and the ballot rotation engine is operable to change the selected order of the associated ballot options among the plurality of contests (See

Art Unit: 3623

figure 4, paragraphs 0019-20, 0033-6, 0041, wherein ballot information is stored by the system, including a plurality of valid, random ballot options).

As per claim 6, Openshaw, II et al. teaches wherein the ballot information includes a plurality of contests with associated ballot options and the ballot rotation engine is operable to change the selected order of corresponding ballot options among selected ones of the plurality of contests (See figure 4, paragraphs 0019-20, 0033-6, 0041, wherein the ordering of the ballot changes amongst the contestants).

As per claim 7, Openshaw, II et al. discloses including a plurality of predetermined ordering schema for use in the ballot rotation engine, each of the contests being identified to a selected one of the of the plurality of predetermined ordering schema (See figure 4, paragraphs 0019-20, 0033-6, 0041, wherein ordering schema are used, each of ballots including identified contestants in a radom ordering).

As per claim 8, Openshaw, II et al. discloses wherein the contest comprises a race for elective officials (See paragraphs 0017, 0021-3, 0026, 0028, 0034, 0041, wherein the voting system is for use in elections, such as presidential elections).

As per claim 9, Openshaw, II, et al. discloses a plurality of ballot options in association with a contest (See figure 4, paragraphs 0019-20, 0033-6, 0041, wherein ballot information is stored by the system, including a plurality of valid, random ballot options). However, Openshaw et al. does not expressly disclose, nor does Miller et al., that the contest comprises a referendum for proposed new legislation.

Openshaw, II et al. and Miller et al. disclose electronically implemented voting system that allow for precinct level control in elections. It is old and well known that ballots include

Art Unit: 3623

questions concerning referendums for proposed legislation on which a voter votes, such as questions on how tax dollars should be allocated. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include questions regarding referendums for proposed new legislation in the ballots of Openshaw, II et al. and Miller et al. in order to increase the reliability, speed, and accuracy of the election process by providing control over the administration of the current voting system. See paragraph 0008 of Openshaw, II et al.

As per claim 10, Openshaw, II et al. teaches an electronically configurable ballot information presentation device operable for presenting the ballot and comprising a personal computer (See figure 4, paragraphs 0019, 0033-6, 0051). However, neither Openshaw, II et al. or Miller et al. disclose a visual display.

Both Openshaw, II et al. and Miller et al. disclose electronically implemented voting systems that allow for precinct level control in elections. Openshaw II, et al. specifically discloses the use of a personal computer in the voting stations. Miller et al. discloses a visual list of candidates in a ballot. Since it is common for PCs to have visual displays, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a visual display in the personal computer of Openshaw, II et al. in order to increase the reliability and accuracy of the election process by increasing comprehension of the choices on the ballot by allowing the voter to both see and hear the choices. See paragraphs 0008, 0075 of Openshaw, II et al.

As per claim 11, Openshaw, II et al. discloses wherein the electronically configurable ballot information presentation device comprises an audio speaker (See figure 1, paragraph 0018, 0020, which discloses an audio ballot).



As per claim 12, Openshaw, II et al. teaches wherein the electronically configurable ballot information presentation device comprises Braille compatibility (See paragraph 0018, which discusses Braille). Openshaw, II et al. further discloses bypassing the system and using a paper ballot when needed (See paragraph 0050). However, Openshaw, II et al. does not expressly disclose, nor does Miller et al., the use of a Braille printer.

Openshaw II et al. discloses an electronically implemented voting system that also employs Braille and printed ballots for the blind and hard of hearing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ a Braille printer in the system of Openshaw II et al. in order to increase the usability of the system by those voters who are hearing impaired. See paragraph, 0050 of Openshaw, II et al. that discloses the use of the system by the hearing impaired.

As per claim 13, Openshaw, II et al. teaches wherein the voter input device comprises a manually actuatable switch (See paragraph 0063, which discloses a key pad).

As per claim 14, Openshaw, II et al. teaches wherein the voter input device comprises a voter-directed ballot navigation tool (See paragraphs 0016-7, 0019, 0022, 0042, 0049, wherein the voter completes the ballot using tools of the system).

As per claim 15, Openshaw, II et al. discloses wherein the predetermined ordering schema of the ballot rotation engine comprises program instructions for randomization of the selected order of ballot options between successive iterations (See paragraphs 0019-0020 and 0041, wherein the ordering is randomized between successive voters).

As per claims 16-18, Openshaw, II et al. discloses predetermined ordering schema of the ballot rotation (See paragraphs 0019-0020 and 0041). However, Openshaw, II et al. does not

Art Unit: 3623

expressly disclose sequential rotation of the ballot options, uprotation of adjacent ballot options, or downrotation of adjacent ballot options.

Miller et al. discloses sequential rotation of the ballot options, uprotation of adjacent ballot options, or downrotation of adjacent ballot options (See pages 324-325, wherein the ballot options are sequentially rotated, rotated up wards, or rotated downwards through alphabetically ordering, reverse alphabetical ordering, and then the moving the first candidate in each instance to the end of the list).

Both Openshaw II, et al. and Miller et al. discuss changing the order of candidate names in ballots in order to ensure fairness. Openshaw II et al. specifically discloses the use of pre-approved, electronic random ballots in order to avoid the need of secure voting booths as other voters would be unable to observe a user's selections. Further, Miller et al. discloses the importance in rotating names to ensure that the name listed first on the ballot does not receive an unfair bias. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to consider the statistic fairness of rotation in order to increase the fairness of an election by ensuring that all candidates' names receive equal consideration.

As per claim 19, Openshaw, II et al. teaches wherein the predetermined ordering schema of the ballot rotation engine comprises program instructions for implementing a system of rotation at a precinct level (See figure 4, paragraphs 0019-20 and 0041, wherein the ballots are rotated at a precinct level).

As per claim 20, Openshaw, II et al. teaches wherein the predetermined ordering schema of the ballot rotation engine comprises program instructions for implementing a system of

Art Unit: 3623

rotation at an election jurisdiction level (See figure 4, paragraphs 0019-20 and 0041, wherein the ballots are rotated at an election jurisdiction level).

As per claims 21-23, Openshaw, II et al. discloses predetermined ordering schema of the ballot rotation (See paragraphs 0019-0020 and 0041). However, Openshaw, II et al. does not expressly disclose that the predetermined ordering schema implements a system of rotation that (i) provides a number of rotation instances for each candidate in a first position of the selected order such that predominance of any one candidate at the top of the selected order is statistically insignificant in influencing an election outcome, (ii) provides, as close as is mathematically possible, an equal number of rotation instances for each candidate at all positions of the selected order, or (iii) implements a lookup table for changing the selected order of the additional voting sessions.

Miller et al. discloses (i) provides a number of rotation instances for each candidate in a first position of the selected order such that predominance of any one candidate at the top of the selected order is statistically insignificant in influencing an election outcome (See pages 298-299 and 324-326, which disclose rotation instances for each candidate in a first position. See also pages 300-304, which discloses statistical results), (ii) provides, as close as is mathematically possible, an equal number of rotation instances for each candidate at all positions of the selected order (See pages 298-299 and 324-326, which disclose rotation instances that assign candidate to each position in the list by precinct, thus trying to normalize the ordering), or (iii) implements a lookup table for changing the selected order of the additional voting sessions (See pages 298-299 and 324-326, wherein the orderings are prescribed by a set methodology).

Art Unit: 3623

Both Openshaw II, et al. and Miller et al. discuss changing the order of candidate names in ballots in order to ensure fairness. Openshaw II et al. specifically discloses the use of pre-approved, electronic random ballots in order to avoid the need of secure voting booths as other voters would be unable to observe a user's selections. Further, Miller et al. discloses the importance in rotating names to ensure that the name listed first on the ballot does not receive an unfair bias. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to consider the statistic fairness of rotation in order to increase the fairness of an election by ensuring that all candidates' names receive equal consideration.

Claim 24 recites substantially similar limitations to claim 1 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

As per claim 25, Openshaw, II et al. teaches a precinct control unit and a plurality of voting stations networked to a precinct control unit, and the step of iterating is performed at a precinct control unit (See figures 2 and 4, paragraphs 0044-8, 0051, 0063, 0068, 0072).

Claims 26-30 recite substantially similar limitations to claims 3-7, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

Claims 31-33 recite substantially similar limitations to claims 10-12, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

Claims 34-42 recite substantially similar limitations to claims 14-22, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

Claim 43 recites substantially similar limitations to claim 1 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, as necessitated by amendment.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Davis et al. (U.S. 6,550,675) discloses candidate rotation and a system that supports the rotation of candidate positions between Polling Places and rotation of candidate positions within a Polling Place.

McClure et al. (U.S. 6,250,548) teaches ballot rotation methods are supported by a jurisdiction and handled in an identical manner in the precinct polling places.

Art Unit: 3623

“Hart Information Services” (www.hartis.com) teaches an electronic voting system that manages the election process per precinct and allows the user to define and create ballot styles per precinct.

“New Name, New Money for Hart Information Services” (PR Newswire) teaches election products such as electronic balloting programs.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (571) 272-6737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*bvd*  
bvd

April 14, 2006

  
TARIQ R. HAFIZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600